



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,214	10/15/2003	Ivan Osorio	011738.00137	7258
22908	7590	08/06/2007		
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. TEN SOUTH WACKER DRIVE SUITE 3000 CHICAGO, IL 60606			EXAMINER MANUEL, GEORGE C	
			ART UNIT 3762	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,214

Applicant(s)

OSORIO ET AL.

Examiner

George Manuel

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Badura et al '234 in view of Branton (US 3,916,923).

Badura et al fails to disclose initiating a cycle ON timer that is responsive to receiving an ON command signal.

Branton teaches a "fail safe" mechanism that is tied into a circuitry and includes a timer set for a period slightly longer than the combined washing and rinse cycles. In the event of a malfunction which results in the washing or sanitizing cycle not being completed within the normal period, the timer in the fail safe circuit will time out and open the circuit to the power lines. Also, Branton teaches incorporating a 24-hour timer in an apparatus, so the sanitizing cycle will be automatically initiated at a preset time and will be completed before a dairyman reaches the barn.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the initiating cycle ON timer that is responsive to receiving the ON command signal as taught by

Branton for providing safety in addition to the redundancy means disclosed in the device of Badura et al for ion beam therapy.

The addition of a timer and its initiator do not otherwise inhibit or limit the ability of the device disclosed in Badura et al to function with redundancy means for ensuring treatment therapy is turned off.

The beam guidance is checked by using redundancy means for a redundant termination of extraction and their functionality is checked, and checking of the ability of beam guidance dipoles in the beam guidance to connect and disconnect is carried out, wherein after an unsuccessful termination request and establishment of an ion beam, a renewed termination request is requested via a separate redundant channel and for independence from a control of an acceleration device, a special cable connection to a last dipole of the beam guidance upstream from a treatment site is provided to a power supply unit, so that a connection of this dipole can be effected only from a therapy supervisory control room via a special signal, wherein a check of connections and terminals of the therapy supervisory control room to the last dipole of the beam guidance and to the redundant channel for an additional termination of extraction is carried out prior to each block of irradiation procedures.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use a timer for timing the interval between the first termination request and the second redundant request because ion beam therapy may comprise residual particle counts. Badura et al suggests that high particle counts should trigger an alarm for switching off the beam and that particle count may vary. See col. 11, lines 31-59.

Regarding claim 4, the examiner is interpreting the disclosed medical electron accelerator disclosed in Badura et al to comprise electrical stimulation treatment therapy.

Regarding claims 5, 6, 9, 12 and 19-22, Badura et al teach loading computer programs and data sets into the control computer of the ion beam therapy system and checking for accurate loading in order to be able to correctly load data required for the irradiation of a patient into the sequence control of the system. Irradiation may commence for only correctly loaded data. Special programs in the server computers allow the supervisory control system to check that programs and data are written into the individual processors of the control computer and read back and compared with the programs and data stored in the individual memories. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the computer executable instruction to further time the interval between termination requests as discussed above for the reasons set forth above because Baura et al teach the readiness for operation of all computer programs and a possible emergency shutdown or release of an irradiation procedure by the medical operating console of the therapy system may be computer controlled.

Art Unit: 3762

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strul et al '681 in view of Branton (US 3,916,923).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the initiating cycle ON timer that is responsive to receiving the ON command signal as taught by Branton for providing safety to the device disclosed in Strul et al.

Strul et al disclose software controlled limits for temperature, power, and impedance (that turn off power if exceeded), there are also redundant hardware controls, including comparators 90, 96, that turn off power if the maximum temperature or power is exceeded. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide a timer for initiating the redundant hardware controls because temperature, power, and impedance have residual energy capacities that diminish with time to allow for a more accurate determination of whether they have been exceeded.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Manuel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4952.

/George Manuel/  
George Manuel  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 3762